

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/915,408	07/26/2001	Jochen Bollaender	1697	7027
7590 09/12/2005			EXAMINER	
STRIKER, STRIKER & STENBY			VU, STEPHEN A	
103 East Neck Road Huntington, NY 11743			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3636	
		DATE MAILED: 09/12/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/915,408	BOLLAENDER ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
•	Stephen A. Vu	3636
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 Journal of the section is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under Expression in the section is the section of the section of the section in the section is the section of the sect	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 6-10 and 12-14 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 6-10 and 12-14 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	wn from consideration. or election requirement. er. epted or b) objected to by the lend of the lend	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 09/915,408

Art Unit: 3636

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 6-10 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wieczorek et al (#5,524,958) in view of McCall et al (#4,865,368).

Wieczorek et al show a holding device (70) comprising a carriage (16) guidable as a drawer to be displaceable back and forth, a guide means for guiding the carriage during its displacement between the positions, and a holder having an insertion opening. The holder can be raised on the carriage when it is pulled out. However, Wieczorek et al do not show a gravity locking device. McCall et al teach a slide latch gravity lock (20) having means to prevent the lock from opening when the apparatus (2) is in its vertical position (see Figures 1-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate McCall et al's

slide latch gravity lock to the holding device of Wieczorek's invention in order to lock the carriage in place with the holding device, when both the carriage and holding device are pivoted from a horizontal position to a vertical position.

With claims 6-10,12, and 14, the guide means is formed so that a path of raising the holder is oriented upwardly in relation to the carriage.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Amendment, filed July 11, 2005, with respect to the rejection of claim 13 under Wieczorek et al (#5,524,958) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Wieczorek et al (#5,524,958) and of McCall et al (#4,865,368). Accordingly, this Office action is considered to be Non-final.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Yamamoto, Bergin, Vairinen, Chung, and Moret are cited as showing similar types of holding device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen A. Vu whose telephone number is 571-272-6862. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

Art Unit: 3636

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter M. Cuomo can be reached on 571-272-6856. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Stephen Vu

September 7, 2005

ghon Vu